



REC Networks / REC ネットワーク

J1 Radio/J1 ラジオ

11541 Riverton Wharf Rd
Mardela Springs, MD 21837
+1 202 621-2355

<http://www.recnet.com>

<http://www.J1FM.tokyo>

Michelle Bradley, CBT

Founder of REC/Director of J1 Radio

REC 代表取締役

J1 ラジオ ディレクター

mae@recnet.com

July 9, 2019

Via ECFS – ***Notice of ex parte presentation***

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St SW
Washington, DC 20554

In the matter of: MB Docket 19-3, MB Docket 18-184, MB Docket 17-105, RM-11810, MB Docket 17-264 and MB Docket 05-6.

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On July 9, 2019, as founder of REC Networks (REC), I met with Alexander Sanjenis, media advisor to Chairman Pai. During the meeting various positions of REC were expressed.

We discussed the importance of LPFM stations, especially in times of emergency. I had discussed the services that station KBUU-LP, Malibu, California provided in the wake of the fire and how they have been involved in the recovery effort. I also discussed my recent trip to Southern California visiting successful LPFM stations including KBUU-LP, KWSV-LP, KXRN-LP and KQLH-LP. I had discussed the success of the FM booster that has been operational for KWSV-LP and mentioned that because of the terrain in the region, FM boosters are necessary to provide local radio in more places.

On **19-3**, I had discussed my concerns regarding gamesmanship in filing as well as site assurance related issues. I did note that some of the questionable applications filed in the 2013 LPFM window could have been avoided if there was a rule or policy in place to require a letter of site assurance at the time of filing. We had also discussed time sharing and the REC “viable time share” proposal previously forward in an *ex parte* presentation to Audio Division staff.

I had discussed the undocketed proceeding proposed by REC to allow noncommercial educational (NCE) qualified organizations in smaller communities to apply for new stations if channels are not available due to urbanized areas and a channel could be used if a second or third adjacent waiver is provided, even with *de minimis* population coverage.

I had expressed a desire for the Commission to proceed with a filing window for new NCE and eventually, LPFM stations after the *Report and Order* in this proceeding.

On **18-184**, I had expressed a “tolerance” for the C4 class of service despite the potential increase of noise floor to some LPFM stations but I had also expressed a strong opposition to the proposal related to §73.215 and suggested that such a proposal would destroy the secondary services including LPFM and the recently awarded AM Revitalization translators. The “waiver” concept previously presented by SSR on *ex parte*, while more tolerable, is not statutorily sound as it would violate Section 5 of the Local Community Radio Act.

I had expressed support for Chairman Pai’s and Commissioner O’Reilly’s efforts on combating the issue with unlicensed broadcasting. At the same time, I also viewed that pirate activity is sometimes a sign of certain communities not being served by the existing stations. I had spoken briefly about REC’s concept for a lower-powered “specialized broadcasting service” in the 11-meter shortwave band. I expressed concerns that I did not want to see the FCC’s latest pirate radio enforcement become a witch hunt for Part 15 users. I had also recommended that Chairman Pai and OET should look at the possibility of increasing some of the tolerances on intentional Part 15 radiators in the AM and FM broadcast bands including increasing FM devices to Canadian standards and allowing AM transmitters more leeway with ground systems. Lastly, I had expressed concern that the Commission has not taken any enforcement actions against amazon.com, eBay and Walmart for the marketing of uncertified imported transmitters that are a hazard to the aeronautical mobile service and public safety.

On **17-105 & RM-11810**, I had expressed my desire for the Commission to issue a *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in respect to the issues that LPFM stations are currently facing from a technical perspective including a complete reinterpretation of the LCRA. I have stated that it is highly desirable that the ability for some stations to upgrade to a 250-watt ERP is possible as it is needed, especially in needs of building penetration.

On **17-264 & 05-6**, I have acknowledged that LPFM stations are statutorily subject to the public notice requirements despite a lack of a regulation implementing it. I have expressed concerns that the requirement that LPFM and NCE new entrants be required to place 4 legal notices in the newspaper during the application process would be burdensome and would be a barrier to entry. I have asked for a reasonable relief for LPFM and NCE applicants that would still comply with statute. This includes only requiring a single ad in the paper or a physical public notice at the organizations’ location visible from the street.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/

Michelle Bradley, CBT
Founder
REC Networks